

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

SHARON TAYLOR,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

USA LAWYERS SERVICE, and ROBERT
STAFFORD,

Defendants-Appellees.

UNPUBLISHED

August 9, 2005

No. 252808

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 03-301766-CK

Before: Zahra, P.J., and Gage and Murray, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Plaintiff appeals as of right from an order denying her motion for summary disposition and “Motion of Objection to an Inadequate Judgment.” The trial court granted plaintiff a judgment in the amount of \$25,000. We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Plaintiff filed a complaint against defendants, claiming legal malpractice. Plaintiff’s complaint alleged that she had paid defendants a \$4,000 retainer fee and, as a result of their negligence, the statute of limitations had expired on her claim against third parties.¹ Defendants filed an answer denying that they abandoned plaintiff’s claim. Plaintiff’s request for production was not answered, and she filed a motion to compel. Before the trial court ruled on the motion to compel, plaintiff moved for summary disposition, claiming that defendants failed to state a valid defense and that defendants failed to participate in discovery. The trial court granted plaintiff a \$25,000 judgment. Plaintiff then filed a “Motion of Objection to an Inadequate Judgment.” At the hearing on plaintiff’s motion for inadequate judgment, the trial court indicated that it had awarded plaintiff \$25,000 as a “default” against defendants. It refused to amend the judgment to provide for a \$250,000 award. The trial court did not provide a basis for its ruling.

¹ In her complaint, plaintiff alleged that she had entered into an agreement for the construction of a new home and paid a construction company \$16,000 before discovering that she had been defrauded. She alleged that this claim was worth \$250,000.

Plaintiff argues that, after granting judgment for \$25,000 in her favor, the trial court erred in denying her motions for “Objection to an Inadequate Judgment” and summary disposition. We review de novo a trial court’s decision on a motion for summary disposition. *Nastal v Henderson & Associates Investigations, Inc*, 471 Mich 712, 720; 691 NW2d 1 (2005). Beyond stating her position, plaintiff offers no cases or other authority that support this claim. “It is not sufficient for a party ‘simply to announce a position or assert an error and then leave it up to this Court to discover and rationalize the basis for his claims, or unravel and elaborate for him his arguments, and then search for authority either to sustain or reject his position.’” *Wilson v Taylor*, 457 Mich 232, 243; 577 NW2d 100 (1998), quoting *Mitcham v Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959). Her failure to properly address the merits of this assertion of error constitutes abandonment of the issue. *Thompson v Thompson*, 261 Mich App 353, 356; 683 NW2d 250 (2004).

Affirmed.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra
/s/ Hilda R. Gage
/s/ Christopher M. Murray